

Jarrold Jones
Pro Se
1850 W Orangethorpe Ave
Fullerton, California, 92833
(714) 497-0035
jarrod@stangranch.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA



DAVID A. STEBBINS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JARROD JONES,

Defendant

Case No.: 8:24-cv-01486-JVS-KES

STATUS REPORT OF MEET AND CONFER FOR
MOTION TO COMPEL, AND MOTION OF
CONTEMPT OF COURT

Pursuant to the Court's order to meet and confer prior to the filing of any motions, I, Jarrod Jones, Pro Se Defendant, respectfully submit this status update concerning a Zoom conference held on October 18, 2024, at 1:00 PM with Plaintiff, David A. Stebbins. The meeting was intended to address Mr. Stebbins' planned motions to compel and for contempt of court, as related to my alleged delay in the payment of the settlement.

During the meeting, I informed Mr. Stebbins of the reason for the brief delay in the October payment. My bank account had been temporarily frozen due to a fraud investigation after I discovered unauthorized charges. As a result, I was unable to access the necessary funds to make the payment by the October 5 deadline. The account was unfrozen on October 8, and I promptly made the payment, which cleared on October 9. Despite this explanation, Mr. Stebbins disregarded these facts and accused me of being dishonest, insisting that the delay was my fault and grounds for contempt of court.

Throughout the meeting, Mr. Stebbins repeatedly engaged in personal attacks and berated me, making it difficult to focus on the motions at hand. He began the discussion with an extended tirade, asserting that I needed a "kick in the rear with contempt charges" to ensure I make future payments on time. It is worth noting that

STATUS REPORT OF MEET AND CONFER FOR MOTION TO COMPEL, AND MOTION OF CONTEMPT
OF COURT - 1

1 contempt charges are payable to the court, not the Plaintiff, and such statements indicate an intent to misuse the legal
2 process for personal gain.

3
4 Moreover, the Plaintiff made several unreasonable demands for information entirely unrelated to
5 the settlement or any court order. He attempted to obtain personal details about my parents, their income sources,
6 and the nature of their lives. These requests are irrelevant, as my parents are not parties to this case. Additionally,
7 Mr. Stebbins wrongly asserted that my father's website (the domain of my email address) is a business, despite my
8 clarification that it is a fan website for cars. His continued insistence on irrelevant details serves no legal purpose
9 and appears to be an attempt to harass me.

10
11 Further, when I sought clarification on how such information was relevant to determining my net
12 worth—an issue that was addressed during the settlement—Mr. Stebbins failed to provide a coherent response.
13 Instead, he resorted to making non-verbal expressions of frustration, which hindered any meaningful discussion.

14
15 Toward the end of the meeting, when I inquired about his proposed contempt motion, Mr.
16 Stebbins responded, "Offer me something," implying that the contempt motion would not be filed if I agreed to
17 additional payments beyond what was stipulated in the settlement. This statement, combined with his earlier
18 behavior, strongly suggests that Mr. Stebbins is seeking to coerce further payments from me through the threat of
19 legal action, despite the matter already being resolved through the settlement agreement. Such conduct raises
20 concerns about the misuse of legal processes for personal financial gain, rather than pursuing justice.

21
22 Following the meeting, Mr. Stebbins sent an email (attached as Exhibit A), in which he demanded
23 that I pay an additional \$129 as a "prorated contempt fine" for the four-day delay in payment. He derived this figure
24 by calculating 4/31st of a \$1,000 contempt charge. This demand is entirely baseless, as there has been no court-
25 ordered fine, and no legal grounds exist for such a calculation. The delay was a direct result of a fraud investigation
26 by my bank, not any willful disobedience on my part. I believe this demand reflects an attempt by Mr. Stebbins to
27 extract additional payments outside the bonds of the court's authority.

28 STATUS REPORT OF MEET AND CONFER FOR MOTION TO COMPEL, AND MOTION OF CONTEMPT
OF COURT - 2

1
2 In closing, the October 18 meeting was not productive in resolving the issues at hand. Instead of
3 focusing on the legal matters, Mr. Stebbins engaged in personal attacks, made irrelevant inquiries into my private
4 life, and attempted to coerce additional payments through threats of contempt motions. Given that I have already
5 made the required payments and provided a reasonable explanation for the brief delay, I respectfully request that the
6 court dismiss any future motions related to this matter as unfounded and intended to harass.

7
8 Dated this day, 19 of October 2024.

9
10
11 
12 Jarrod Jones, Pro Se Defendant
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

EXHIBIT A

